AND FINAL

MINUTES OF THE THIRTY-FIRST TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
NAVY INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM
NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING CENTER (NETC)
NEWPORT, RHODE ISLAND

January 18, 1996

BROWN AND ROOT ENVIRONMENTAL
CONTRACT NO. N62472-90-D-1298
CONTRACT TASK ORDER NO. 0173

Prepared by:
Mr. Stephen S. Parker
Project Manager

Prepared for:
Mr. Robert Krivinskas
Remedial Project Manager
U.S. Navy, Northern Division

MINUTES OF THE THIRTY-FIRST TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 18, 1996

The thirty-first meeting of the technical review committee for Naval Education and Training Center sites was held at Building 1 of the Naval Education and Training Center, on January 18, 1996. The meeting was held to discuss two items:

1. Selection of the members of the Restoration Advisory Board, which is being formed to replace the Technical Review Committee.

2. Discuss the outstanding questions that the committee has in regards to the Work Plan for Site Assessment Screening Evaluation at the former Derecktor Shipyard.

The minutes of the meeting are presented below, followed by two attachments. Attachment A presents a list of meeting attendants, and Attachment B includes the meeting agenda and handouts.

I OPENING REMARKS - Captain John Wyman, Department of Public Works, Naval Education and Training Center

Captain Wyman welcomed everyone, and stated that he was looking forward to working with the Restoration Advisory Board.

II SELECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD Brad Wheeler, NETC Environment

Mr. Wheeler stated that 14 persons applied to be members of the RAB, and the Commanding Officer has decided to select all of them to participate in the RAB.
ALT IF SAME ORG
The RAB will meet every two months. The first meetings will be organizational and educational, involving acquainting the members with the sites and the base, deriving a charter, and selecting co-chairs. The following meetings will be more technical in nature.
RPM meetings will continue every other month as they have done in the past.

Mr. Richard Gottlieb (RIDEM) raised a concern about the number of persons in a group of that type, and the difficulty in reaching a consensus about issues.

> Mr. Wheeler responded that there would be an attendance requirement, and after the members realize how much time membership may require, several may drop out. Mr. Wheeler reaffirmed that the Navy felt that they should include everyone who feels they have a stake in the process.

7

The first RAB meeting will be held February 8, 1996 at 7:00 PM, at the Officers Club on Coasters Harbor Island. Mr. Wheeler will send out an agenda, and advertise as a public meeting. (It was clarified that the RAB meetings will be open to public attendance, but the members will be the only persons allowed to participate.)

III SITE ASSESSMENT SCREENING EVALUATION (SASE) WORK PLAN, FORMER DERECKTOR SHIPYARD - Stephen S. Parker, Brown & Root Environmental

Mr. Parker (B&R Environmental) led off by explaining that the U.S. EPA never received the Revised Responses to Comments to the Draft SASE Work Plan (B&R Environmental Correspondence dated 12/13/95). ~~This was apparently a result of the furloughs that took place at the U.S. EPA offices in December.~~ New copies of this transmittal were handed to U.S. EPA and their contractor, CDM.

EPA TO DETERMINE REQ'D REVIEW TIME

Mr. Parker introduced the outstanding issues as he understood them to be, and invited members to express any additional concerns or issues as the meeting progressed.

1. The target interval of surface soil sample collections was discussed at some length. The U.S. EPA and the Navy support a 0 to 1 foot sample interval, while the RIDEM requested a 0 to 2 foot sample interval (RIDEM has new regulations due out in June which describe this requirement). It was decided that ~~since the project is progressing before implementation of the regulations~~, the 0 to 1 foot interval will be used for this first study. INFO NEEDED FOR RISK DUE TO SURFACE EXPOSURE

2. The impact of PAHs in surface soil samples under asphalt was discussed. B&R Environmental proposed to extrude the 0 to 4 inch interval of soils due to contaminants introduced to the soils from asphalt and pavement cover. The following related suggestions were made:

   - Split cores for analysis of TPH and BNA compounds in the 4 to 12 inch interval and all other parameters in the 0 to 12 inch interval.
   - Extrude all soils from the 0 to 4 inch interval for all parameters.
   - Extrude only the 0 to 2 inch interval, extrude only the underlying gravel, or allow the geologist to determine the top of soil at each boring.

   It was initially decided that the field personnel would be allowed to make the determination as to what is the bottom of the asphalt layer, and then collect all parameters of the surface soil sample from 4 to 12 inches below the bottom of the asphalt layer. As a result, the boring log will show the ground surface as the bottom of the asphalt layer, but overlying materials (asphalt, concrete, debris) will all be described in detail on the boring log as positive distances *above* the ground surface. STRATEGY OK PER KYM SUBSEQUENT CALL.

   An example boring log is presented as Attachment C to these minutes.

   RIDEM and U.S. EPA will provide other suggestions or concurrence after their internal risk personnel can be consulted.

3. EPA and RIDEM requested justification in the work plan for the selection of the size of sand used in construction of the overburden monitoring wells. RIDEM requested that there be an ability to change the filter pack and screen slot size in the field based on the formation. There was concurrence on this issue with the understanding that proposed adjustments in the work plan will be described in the meeting minutes.

   The work plan will be amended as follows:

   Section 3.3.2.4: New text starting with a new fifth paragraph:

   > *Well screens and sandpacks used for overburden well installations will be sized in accordance with the geologic formation at each boring location. Well screens with slot sizes of 0.010 (0.25 mm) and 0.020 (0.5 mm) will be available at the site. Filter pack sizes of 20-40 (0.85 mm - 0.425 mm) and 10-20 (2.0 mm - 0.85 mm) sieve size sand will be available for installation with each respective screen aperture.*
   >
   > *Screen aperture size and filter pack will be selected based on a visual inspection of the split barrel soil samples collected from the screened interval. The field geologist/engineer will classify the soil sample, and visually estimate the quantity of the coarse sand fraction present in the screen interval. If coarse sand (defined in ASTM D 2487-92 as ranging in size from 2 mm to 4.75 mm diameter) represents a minimum of 70% by weight of the mass, a 0.020 slot screen and 10-20 sieve size filter pack will*

be installed, If coarse sand represents less than 70% of the screen interval, a 0.010 slot screen and 20-40 sieve size filter pack will be installed.

However, if the screen interval is highly stratified, containing lenses of silty soils, a 0.010 slot screen and 20-40 sieve size filter pack will be installed to minimize siltation of the well.

4. It was proposed that in general, the wells be installed in the saturated overburden, spanning the vertical interval that exhibited the highest concentrations of contaminants by screening analysis. Using this process, if an LNAPL is present, the well screen would be installed across the water table because this interval would show the highest concentration of contaminants present. There was general concurrence on this approach.

5. B&R Environmental proposed the use of low flow sampling using 8/95 U.S. EPA SOP. This method was selected because it minimizes disturbance of the formation and allows collection of non-turbid samples which will provide more accurate results, particularly for metals analysis. RIDEM voiced concern with the method because there have been numerous problems documented by persons using the procedure. However, they concurred with the use of the process provided there was an allowance to use bailers if problems occurred during low-flow collections.

   It was further clarified that water chemistry readings would be made every 3 to 5 minutes, rather than every one liter or five minutes as previously proposed. Overall, there must be strict adherence to the SOP.

6. As a clarification, B&R Environmental proposed to extend the standard suite of laboratory analytes to include TPH by IR. This proposal was met with a general agreement.

7. The process for field modifications was proposed, as described in the overhead (Attachment B to these minutes). This procedure was met with general consensus. The Navy concurred that any change executed without regulatory concurrence would be performed at risk.

8. "Background" locations for monitoring well installations were reviewed. There was concurrence that two wells should be installed in "unimpacted areas" upgradient of the site. Brad Wheeler provided an aerial photo, and two locations were tentatively identified: Upgradient of Gate 11, and to the southeast of the site in a small grassy area near Gate ~~4(?).~~ 10 EVALUATE
   The regulatory parties agreed to ~~consider~~ these locations as appropriate "background" soil and groundwater sample collection points, and reply within two weeks of receipt of meeting minutes.

9. Comparison of background with site data was briefly discussed. CDM suggested that site data should be compared with maximum concentrations detected in background samples. RIDEM suggested that an average of background data be used for comparison. B&R Environmental stated that summary statistics will be presented at a future meeting, and exceedences of contaminants above different values will be identified, but not expressed as ratios. A consensus could then be determined for how to identify primary site contaminants. There was general agreement on this approach. LOWEST

10. The U.S. EPA asked that the work plan state that the Eco-walkover be performed by a qualified ecologist (concurrence). Further that the regulatory parties be allowed to accompany (concurrence). In addition, exposure pathways should be discussed. CDM stated that the revisions that are in the draft final work plan are adequate for this stage of the process. B&R Environmental stated that exposure pathways and receptor groups will be identified in the report, but it is inappropriate to speculate on them in the work plan.

11. The U.S. EPA asked what comparisons would be made for risk evaluations. B&R Environmental stated that for nature and extent (Section 4.0 of the SASE report) a comparison to "background" or upgradient data will be made. For ecological and public health risk, a comparison to toxicological benchmarks will be made. B&R Environmental reiterated that comparisons would simply show exceedences, and would not be expressed as ratios.

ATTACHMENT A

LIST OF MEETING ATTENDANTS

CALCULATION WORKSHEET Order No. 19116 (01-91) PAGE _____ OF _____

CLIENT		JOB NUMBER	
SUBJECT			
BASED ON		DRAWING NUMBER	
BY	CHECKED BY	APPROVED BY	DATE

Sign-In Sheet
NETC - Newport
TRC Mtg No. 31
January 18, 1996

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE
Gordon Bullard	Brown & Root	508-658-7899
Stephen Parker	" "	" " "
Paul Kulp.	RIDEM	401-277-3872
Robert Krivinskas	NORTHDIV RPM	610 595 0567 X134
Richard Gottlieb	RIDEM/OSR	401-277-3872 x7138
Todd Bober	NAVY	610-595-0567 x160
Kymberlee Keckler	USEPA	(617) 573-5777
Mary Bothier	CDM	(617) 742-2659 or
Carleen Rosin	CDM	(617) 252-8440
Shannon Behr	Navy (610-595-0567)	617-252-8221
Brad Wheeler	NETC	401 841-6375

ATTACHMENT B

MEETING AGENDA AND HANDOUTS

ATTACHMENT C

EXAMPLE BORING LOG

BORING LOG — **HALLIBURTON NUS CORPORATION**

PROJECT: DERECKTOR SHIPYARD SASE | LOCATION: MW1 | DRILLED BY: XYZ | BORING NO.: MW1

DATE STARTED: N-N-96 | INCLINATION: VERT | LOGGED BY: THROCKMORTON | GROUND ELEV.: XXX

DATE COMPLETED: N-N-96 | BEARING: | CHECKED BY: | TOTAL DEPTH: XX'

ELEV. feet	DEPTH feet	SAMPLE TYPE-NO.	SAMPLE BLOWS PER 6"	SAMPLE PEN. in.	SAMPLE REC. in.	REMARKS ON ADVANCE OF BORING	GRAPHIC LOG	SOIL AND ROCK DESCRIPTIONS
	0.5							
	-0.3							ASPHALT PVMT.
	-0.1							
	0.0							
	0.1		18			4" Gravel + Soil Extruded		CRUSHED STONE
	0.2							
	0.3							Br. F SAND + SILT
	0.4							
	0.5		5	12	10	S-1: DSY-MW1-SB-0001		
	0.6							
	0.7							
	0.8							
	0.9							
	1.0							
			8			S-2: DSY-MW1-SB-0103		Gr-Brn F. SAND
			7					
	2.0			24	19			
			7					
			7					
	3.0							
			9			S-3: DSY-MW1-SB-0305		(etc...)
			12					
	4.0			24	16			
			16					
			20					
	5.0							
	6.0							

LEGEND:
TYPE-NO - Type of sample
C - Rock core sample
S - Split barrel sample
BLOWS PER 6" - 140 lb. hammer falling 30" to drive a split barrel sampler; coring time per foot of rock
PEN - Penetration length of sampler
REC - Length of sample recovered
▽ - Natural ground water table

NOTES:

DATE: NN-96 | PROJECT NO.: 1703
PAGE: OF | BORING NO.: MW1

Brown & Root Environmental

A Division of Halliburton NUS Corp.

55 Jonspin Road
Wilmington, Massachusetts 01887
(508) 658-7899

FAX TRANSMITTAL SHEET

Fax Number: (508) 658-7870

To: Bob Krivinskas Date: 1-23-96

Company: Norbern Drum Location: _____

Fax Number: (610) 595-0555 Extension: _____

From: Steve Parker

Page 1 of 11

Charge Number: 1203-0124

Special Instructions/Message: Attached are the minutes from the TRC Meeting on Thursday. Minutes from the EAB meeting will be forthcoming this afternoon. Please review these minutes & provide any suggestion to me before we issue them to the EPA/DEM.

Thanks.

Fax Sent:

Date: _____ Time: _____

By: _____

If there are any problems in receiving this fax, please call (508) 658-7899.

New England District